

WHOLE NO. 329.

Hence, any wicked practice, as slave-holdin

or sabbath-breaking, dreads nothing so much as examination. Hence, also, Satan, who knows that this world's atmosphere slowly kills what is good, and fosters what is bad; was against all just principles as Russia destroyed the armies of Napoleon, viz: avoids meeting them in conflict, till the world's climate, (more destructive of righteousness than Russia's to the French) chills and exterminates them. The men, therefore, and the institutions which have stood aloof from the slavery-discussion—who have, from the first, looked coldly or wining on those who have spoken while they were silent; have thrown all their weight into the slavery-scale. They have given to slavery the only defence which the case admitted. And the non-committal policy tears the same on every case, where truth and righteousness are in conflict with error and sin.

If, then, I am asked, "What ought our Colleges and Seminary faculties to do for reform?"

With the utmost simplicity and directness, I reply:

Those Faculties ought to lead their students, both by precept and example, to take the simple ground of opposition to prevailing sins, which truth demands: and to do their utmost, by prayer and instruction to infuse into the youth a zeal for reformation which will enable them to breast the after opposition which they will meet from the world. We want a martyr-age of Colleges and Seminaries, to send forth a host of young men at the sound of whose going the whole land shall tremble: men who will not rest while one way or practice in the community violates the law of God—who will toil for Christ as assiduously as the minions of Popery drudge for the man of Sin; and who will withstand established evils meekly, openly, and boldly, as Luther withstood his accusers at the Diet of Worms.

Till God raise up such means and such men, Christ's Gospel never will triumph at the West. For the antagonism which any country presents to the Gospel, will always be strong in proportion to its means of luxury & wealth. Iceland & the High Alps easily receive an offered Saviour. The poor and the industrious welcomed him when on earth; while the man of great possessions turned sorrowing away.

Judging by this principle, no spot of earth, perhaps, will yield more reluctantly to a religion which crucifies to the world, than this Valley of the West; where all the advantages of land and sea seem to meet; where inland ships, groaning under the riches of its soil, are propelled along our rivers by that power which turns the spindle, or towed across our plains by the force that drags the plough. The men in whose hands the blessed gospel shall successfully resist and control such a tide of worldly influences, must be men who will fix their eyes on the complete triumph of the Gospel, resolved to see it attained or die in the attempt—who are willing to be despised, hated, persecuted, and, if need be, die, even by hunger and toil for the triumph of the cross.

Such men our colleges, but especially our Theological Seminaries, under God, must afford. In short, the intellect and education of this nation ought to be set for the nation's deliverance from all practical disobedience to God. I do not say that the old ways of learning should be forsaken, but that all learning should be made subsidiary to a correct, "Theory and practice of human life." All the business and amusements, the food, the drink, the social intercourse and solitary hours of men; their journeys, their politics, their churches, societies, business corporations, the actual life of men, in short, must be examined, and whatever is wicked in it, so exposed, that Christians may act every moment for the glory of God, without being betrayed by ignorance into sin. And to withstand the popular odium incident to this work they need the zeal of Apostles and the Spirit of Martyrs. They may yet have occasion to exhibit both.

As to our benevolent Societies:—Their agents ought, in the prosecution of their labors, to avoid all sectional and irrelevant debates; such as disputed boundaries, party animosities, and contested claims. But there are no local questions in morals. All the principles of Christ's kingdom run every where; pervade every Society; and concern every man. Therefore, he that is not with them all, is against them all. For they are so related that no man can truly receive one, without that state of heart which admits the whole: and he who does not, according to his light and power, receive and defend them all, has never heartily embraced one. You never can make thinking people believe that the man who shrinks from opposing one plain sin, is at heart opposed to another. If such a man warmly decries certain sins, he does it, either as a trade to live by, or out of spite at those particular sins. But if people observe an agent or secretary of a society, not forgetting—not omitting—but studiously avoiding all allusion to sins which are near him, while praying and pleading for money for the suppression of the very same sins at a great distance, they will not long consider him either a Christian or an honest man. Now as Slaveholding, Caste, Concubinage and other customs violative of God's law, are the elements of heathenism in Asia, Africa and the Islands; no Mission, Bible, or Tract Board can retain its hold on the consciences of enlightened and reflecting Christians; whose agents' zeal for the suppression of these sins is in the inverse ratio of the distance of the sinners. For the plain reason that such zeal is mercenary, and not rooted in the love of God. The only way to save the cause is to employ no such men.

In exact illustration of my meaning is the following instance:

One of the Secretaries from New York, at our ecclesiastical convention, in Cincinnati, in June last, (1842) spoke at length, to a large audience, on the obstacles to the Gospel in the west, and the dangers to our country arising from them. He dwelt earnestly on Popery, Infidelity, Mormonism, Popular Ignorance etc. etc.; but though he stood on the very confines of slavery, he never once alluded to slave holding, which every well informed man considers, in point of endangering the country, and obstructing the gospel, scarcely inferior to the worst evil which he named. The reason why he did not mention slavery, was, obviously, that it would have been unpopular to have done so.

Now while our benevolent Societies keep, each to its own appropriate sphere of labor, their agents must be men who will not, in any place, "sauce to declare the whole counsel of God." A class of travelling agents and secretaries whose minds are degraded to a level with those politicians whose ruling principle in speaking is the dread of losing votes—who will oppose only what "the people" are opposed to—who raise their opinions to fit one atmosphere, and lower them to suit another; are unfit to handle moral and religious subjects. Christ's cause will surely suffer in their hands. They come at length to be regarded by the people as a sort of religious sponges, without character or use, but to absorb and yield money. And their example infects and corrupts all the young candidates for the ministry who respect them for the station which they fill.

This is not all. Such men, who occupy an equivocal position in active morals—the spiritual enuchs of the church, like natural enuchs in palaces; are ever addicted to management and stratagem in proportion as they lack honesty and courage to contend for the right. And they busy themselves, wherever they go, in the pulling of small wires, in elevating this man and depressing that, in promoting one institution and detaching from another, to bring into the foreground, men after their own heart; and thus make the posts of influence, as in all corrupt organizations, accessible only to supple and dexterous and heartless men; who will not deny themselves for truth and holiness, but disengage those who will. Travelling agencies, and itinerant preaching in general, expose the best men to violent temptations to form such an odious character. Whether any fall before the temptations, God and those who know them will judge.

Never, never, will the church—which is the sanctuary of God—be cleansed till those things are changed. While the prominent men of the various church denominations, speak equivocally, faintly, or not at all against prevailing sins, the mass will yield to the violent temptations which those prevailing sins present; the whole head will be sick and the whole heart faint; and our land remain unhealed.

But let once the superincumbent weight of non-committal mind be taken off and the idea of bringing the world to obey God, by prayer, and argument, and rebuke and entreaty, will fall on the slumbering energies of the church like a battle cry upon a sleeping army. Honest, though ignorant people will no longer seek fuel for their natural zeal, of Miller and the Mormon.

Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And it will be clearly seen that Christ is marshalling his host for the battle of the great day of God.

"Fill every creature rise and bring
Particular homage to our King
Angels descend with songs again
And earth repeat the loud AMEN."

Gov. Shannon's Inaugural Address.

Gentlemen of the Senate and House of Representatives:

I embrace this occasion to express to my fellow citizens my grateful acknowledgments, and deep sense of gratitude, for the proof they have given me of their confidence, in calling me to the high office whose duty I am about to assume.

A large amount of individual indebtedness exists among our citizens, which paralyzes their exertions and contributes largely to the pressure of the times. To become disengaged from that indebtedness under which we labor will be the work of some time; but we have reason to believe that the day is not far distant, when our ample resources with the industry and enterprise of our citizens, will enable us to discharge with fidelity, all engagements, and secure a return of good times and individual and national prosperity. Our wheat crop alone, this year, has been estimated at about twenty-four millions of bushels; while ten millions will be amply sufficient for home consumption, we will have fourteen millions for exportation. This, at an average price of fifty cents the bushel, will realize seven millions of dollars, from this one article of export. When we add to this the proceeds of our various other articles of export, we will have an aggregate, this year, falling little short of eighteen or twenty millions.

On the other hand, the imports into our state are greatly diminished when compared with former years. A laudable spirit of economy seems to pervade the whole community. I think it may be safely said, that our exports will exceed our imports this year, from six to eight millions. This alone, when added to the present amount of currency in the state, would furnish us with an amount of currency which would give to business and the various branches of industry, a healthy and vigorous growth which would be stable and permanent, because it would be real and not fictitious. But the indebtedness of former years remains to be satisfied. The farmers are indebted to the merchants, the merchants are indebted to the east; and thus the large balance of trade in our favor by eastern creditors to satisfy claims that had their origin in years of extravagance. Those debts are, however, in a rapid progress of being paid, and when once satisfied it will require but a few prosperous crops, and fair prices, to enable us to obtain, in return for our various exports, sound healthy and abundant circulation for all the practical uses and business operations of the country.

When we reflect that our immense agricultural and other resources are only beginning to be developed—that only a small portion of our rich and fertile lands have been subdued by the hand of industry—that thousands of acres are being added yearly to the domain of the plough—that our state and public improvements are about being completed—opening up new avenues and channels through which our various productions can be transported to a foreign market, we have reason to believe that our exports, in a few years will be double their present amount. A State with an export now of eighteen or twenty millions, with a moral certainty of its doubling in amount in a few years, cannot long be depressed, unless she is checked in her onward march to prosperity and wealth by false and mistaken policy in legislation.

Measures of national importance have recently been brought forward and pressed on the public mind with great zeal, which I fear, if permitted to be carried out to the extent claimed, will prove highly prejudicial to the great agricultural interests of the West. The most prominent of these is a high protective tariff, which so deeply agitates the public mind some years since, and which is now sought to be revived under the plausible but deceptive idea, of encouraging home industry, and creating a home market for our various agricultural productions. That this measure is calculated to have an important bearing on our interest, either for good or evil cannot be doubted; hence, the importance of giving to it a careful consideration, with the view of throwing our influence either for or against it, as we may deem it advantageous or hostile to our interest, and the true policy of the country.

To a tariff for revenue purposes, honestly adjusted with that view, and furnishing incidental protection to our manufacturers, I have no objection, but on the contrary, am favorable. It is a convenient mode of supplying the national treasury with the necessary means of carrying on the government, and one to which the public mind has long been accustomed and has been acquiescent in, generally, without much complaint from any quarter. A duty imposed, whether it is great or small, on the importation of foreign goods, is a protection, to the amount of that duty, to the manufacturers of this country. We are told, from an authentic source, that it will require twenty-seven millions annually to supply the necessary demand of the national treasury. More than three millions of this cannot be raised from the sale of our public lands, leaving twenty-four millions annually to be raised by a revenue tariff. To raise this sum, will probably require a duty of twenty-five per cent.

When we add to this duty the cost of importing goods from Europe, which is about eight per cent, we will find that our manufacturers would have an advantage in the American market, over the foreign importer, of thirty-three per cent. This, I believe, would furnish to our manufacturers all fully to compete with foreign rivals. The tariff thus based on the revenue principle, furnishing incidental protection to our manufacturing interest, is all that should be desired. This interest will then receive more of the fostering care of the government than any other in the country.

The limits of this address will not permit a general discussion of the tariff. There are a few reflections however, connected with the high protective policy, as contra-distinguished from the tariff for revenue, which, I trust, will not be considered out of place on the present occasion. Such a tariff will either raise the price of manufactured articles to the consumer, or it will not. If it raises the price to the consumer, then it is a tax on the agricultural and non-manufacturing classes, for the benefit of the manufacturing capitalists, and instead of encouraging home industry, is a tax on the labor of the great mass, for the benefit of the few. If it does not raise the price to the consumer, it can be of no advantage to the manufacturer. If it diminishes the price, as some claim, it is a positive injury, and not a benefit. It is a measure which would create a home market for our agricultural productions. But, if it does raise the price to the consumer, by excluding foreign goods, and giving to the American manufacturers a monopoly of the home market; hence, the solicitude of manufacturing capitalists to procure an increase of duties. It becomes us, then, to inquire what effect the protective policy will have on the great staples of the West. It will cut off, or at least diminish, our foreign trade. Other nations will not buy from us, unless we buy from them. If we exclude their productions from our market, by duties so high as to prevent them from selling at a fair profit, they will not purchase our productions.

Nations, like individuals, will trade with each other so long as they can exchange their respective commodities on mutually advantageous terms, but no longer. The advocates of protection, claim that it will furnish us a sure and steady home market for our breadstuffs and other staples, which will be advantageous, and more to be relied on, than a foreign market. However plausible this may appear at first view, I apprehend it will not bear the test of critical investigation. The manufacturers who are to consume our breadstuffs and other staples, do not number more than half a million. Suppose the number should be doubled, under the favorable auspices of the protective policy, what amount of the great staples of the West could they consume? The West could not give to monopolize the whole market. The agriculturalists in the Northern and Middle States would supply this demand, at least to a considerable extent, if not entirely. The West, therefore, could not hope to find a market in that quarter, under the most favorable aspect of trade, for more than three or four millions of bushels of wheat.

To supply this northern market, the five great western States, and two Territories, embracing a region of country unsurpassed by any other portion of the globe, of similar extent, in its capacity to furnish breadstuffs, would come in competition. This vast region of country, in a few years, will be able to export, annually, sixty millions of bushels of wheat alone. Should the west be able to sell all its northern manufactures, even ten millions annually, while the remaining fifty millions find a market? It must seek for an outlet in the south, and foreign countries. The idea, therefore, of building up a home market for the vast productions of the west, is, in my judgment, visionary in the extreme. We want the market of the world for our productions; and that policy that has a tendency to cut off our foreign trade, and exclude our staples from the foreign market, is hostile to our true interest. If, in seeking to build up the home, we should lose the foreign market, we would find but little to console us, in the increased price of the articles we consume, caused by a high protective tariff. In adopting the protective policy, we should look at the prospective, as well as present bearing such a measure will have on our trade, and interchange of commodities, when once sacrificed under a mistaken policy, may not readily be regained. A large amount of the wheat of Ohio and Michigan has found its way to England through the Canada, within the last few years, by paying mere nominal duties. This is an important trade now to the agricultural interest of Ohio, and under favorable commercial relations, would greatly increase in magnitude and importance. Yet this trade, so important to us, is in danger of being sacrificed to the protective policy.

If it be true, as is claimed by the South, (and we have no reason to doubt it), that the protective tariff policy is hostile to the great cotton growing interest of that region, and if persisted in as the permanent policy of the government, must prove a great injury to us, it is better for us to inquire what effect the destruction or depression of that interest would have on our own trade, and the general prosperity of the country. The cotton planters of the South purchase, annually, a large amount of our staple commodities, and are our consumers. Should they be compelled, by the policy of the government, to abandon or diminish the cotton growing business and turn their attention to the raising of the staple staples we produce, instead of purchasing our productions, and being our consumers, they would become our rivals, and our market in that quarter would be entirely destroyed. But the cotton growing interest of the South is a great national interest, and is one of the principle sources of our national wealth. It cannot be destroyed or crippled without affecting, to a great extent, our national wealth and prosperity.

Our cotton exports in 1840 amounted, I believe, to upwards of sixty millions; and, in former years, it had been greater. The idea of creating a home market for this great staple, cannot be realized. The manufacturers of this country consume about three hundred thousand bales; while the aggregate annual production is about two millions. It is obvious, therefore, that in relation to cotton as well as wheat, we are deeply interested in having a foreign market, and that any policy that would have a tendency to cut off the foreign market, would be calculated to diminish our national wealth, and materially affect the grain growing region of the West.

We are alike interested in the growth and prosperity of the manufacturing interest of the North and the planting interest of the South. Both these great interests purchase, to some extent, our productions. Their ability to purchase from us depends on the success and prosperity of their business. Holding the balance of power, as we view the west, between these two interests, we should so exercise it as to sustain both, and not prostrate either the one or the other. Our own interest, the wealth and prosperity of the whole Union, the harmony of the States, and the principles of justice and patriotism, dictate to us this policy. A tariff for revenue, honestly adjusted for that purpose, furnishing incidental protection to our manufacturers, it is believed, would have this tendency: while a high protective tariff, looking to protection as its main object, would be unjust and unequal in its operations, hostile to our foreign trade, and highly prejudicial to the agricultural and other non-manufacturing interests.

The ultimate benefit of such a measure, even to the manufacturer, might be questioned. Stability in our national policy is desirable to every branch of business—to none more so than the manufacturing interest. The experience of former years should admonish all, that the protective policy to that extent claimed by the manufacturers will not be quietly acquiesced in by a majority of the American People.

Among the various national measures that have recently occupied the public mind, none have been advocated with more zeal, by one portion of our fellow citizens, than the creation of a National Bank. Believing that this measure is unconstitutional, and that the Federal Government should studiously refrain from the exercise of all powers not delegated, or such as are considered doubtful, and that the preservation of our National compact unimpaired is a sacred duty we owe to ourselves and to posterity, I could, under no circumstances, approve the creation of such an institution. As a measure of expediency, I cannot think a United States Bank would be calculated to promote, in any form, the public welfare. In directing our policy in the future, we should consult the history of the past. The admonitions of experience should not be disregarded and thrown away, and we should not rush blindly into a measure which has been tried and proved, not only an entire failure, but which in its various influences and final overthrow has been instrumental in defrauding an honest, confiding, and unsuspecting community out of millions.

With this example and instructive lesson before us, what prospect of relief has the country from the creation of another National Bank? What security have we that such an institution would be placed under the control of men more skillful, prudent, or honest than those who directed and managed the former?

Money, coupled with power and influence, has a corrupting and demoralizing tendency on the human mind, and, under like circumstances, will generally produce like effects. We have no reason, therefore, to hope that another National Bank would share a different fate from the former, or that it would give relief to the country or in any shape promote the public interest.

The veto by the President of the U. States, in my judgment, deserves the approbation and applause of every true friend of his country, as being preservative of the Constitution, and calculated to prevent in future, a repetition, of the frauds and innumerable evils inflicted on the country by the late bank. An honest and virtuous community smarting under the wrong committed by that institution, will not hesitate to award to the executive of the United States that just meed of praise which, in all cases, should follow an honest and fearless exercise of constitutional power for the good of the country.

The subject of banks and the currency is one of absorbing interest to the community. The great extent of injury and wrong inflicted on the public, through the instrumentality of the present unguarded and irresponsible system of banking, within the last few years, together with the present activity of a circulating medium, and the general indebitness of the country, give to this subject an unusual interest among the people at this time.

In my inaugural address of 1838, and my two subsequent annual messages to the General Assembly, I took occasion to give my views at length, and in detail, on the subject of banks and currency. I also embraced the same occasion to express my decided convictions against the policy of creating a State Bank, in any form. I could do but little more than reiterate the views and opinions heretofore expressed on this subject, to the General Assembly.

My mind in relation to this important subject, has undergone no material change, but, on the contrary, my previous convictions have been rather strengthened and confirmed by subsequent observation and reflection. I still entertain the opinion, as heretofore expressed, that no system of banking could be adopted in this State, which would have the prospect of success, as a system of local banks, with an increased personal liability in the stockholders, and surrounded by such legal guards, restrictions, and responsibilities as will secure the public, as far as practicable, against an inflated circulation, the note holders against loss, and the community against the innumerable evils of bank suspensions. In establishing any system of banking, every consideration of justice and public policy demands, that the people, for whose benefit alone banks ought to be created, should be made secure. That such has been the case heretofore, few persons, if any at this time, the severe losses of experience which we have had, will contend, and it remains yet to be tested, by the adoption of a reformed system of banking, whether this desirable object can be fully secured.

It is believed that, by the combined influence of various restrictions and limitations, and the increased liability of stockholders, with the supervisory control of bank commissioners, and by the creation of an adequate safe fund, the evils inflicted on the country heretofore, by banks of circulation, may in a great measure, be avoided, without in the least impairing their ability to promote the public good, or preventing them from realizing a fair profit on the capital invested. This subject is one on which it is to be expected a great variety of opinions will be honestly entertained, and should therefore be approached in a spirit of conciliation and forbearance, as it doubtless will, and with an earnest desire to carry out the will of the people. It has occupied the public mind for the last five years, and has been extensively discussed by the public prints, and in the primary assemblies of the people, and it is presumed, is better understood now than at any former period.

The public judgment may, therefore, be considered as mature and settled on this subject; and the inquiry will necessarily present itself to our minds—what is the will and wish of the people? What is their will, and whatever they desire in relation to banks and the currency, should be the object of their Representatives to secure as far as practicable. The will of the people on this, as on all other subjects, should be the polar star, which the Representatives should be governed. Whatever the Representatives may think, individually, of a mixed currency, in conformity to the genius of our Representative form of Government, he should yield his individual views to the mature judgment and known will of his constituents. Coming, as you do, from every part of the State, and having mingled extensively with the people, and heard them express their views and wishes on this subject, you will no doubt be able to carry out the public will, and settle, at least for the present, this question, in a manner satisfactory to the great body of the community.

In creating banks, care should be taken to guard against any unnatural inflation of the currency. The idea of raising the price of wheat, or any other staple commodity which we produce and transport to a foreign market, by increasing the amount of bank paper in this State, I believe to be a fallacy, and calculated to deceive. The price of our wheat, and other articles of export, must mainly depend on the price which they command in the foreign market. The price which they will command in the foreign market will depend on the demand and supply, and upon the inflated or depressed state of the circulation at that point. The price of wheat in Ohio will depend upon the price of wheat in New York, New Orleans, or at other points to which it may be transported and sold. The price of our cattle will depend on their value in the Eastern market; and so with every other article raised in this State, and sold in a foreign market. An inflation of the currency at the points where our productions are sold and consumed, would, undoubtedly, raise the price there, and consequently, here. But an unnatural augmentation of the currency at home, beyond the real business wants of the community would only have a tendency to raise the price of the articles we purchase and consume, and not those we export, and consequently, would have a tendency to swell the profits of the foreign producer, impoverish the State, and increase our pecuniary embarrassments. In creating banks therefore; our object should not be to inflate prices, as that cannot be done successfully as to our exports, and when applied to our imports, is a tax on our own labor and industry.

I would respectfully urge upon you the policy, and even the necessity, of avoiding any further increase of our State debt, except such as may be demanded in order to meet promptly and faithfully our present contracts. The credit of our State, and the public faith, should be held inviolate.

At present our State bonds are selling at a price which cannot be accounted for without looking to extraneous causes. They may be found in the failure of many of the States to pay the interest on their bonds, while a fear has been excited that some of the States may repudiate their debts.

This has had a tendency to throw discredit on all State stocks, and the good and bad have been confounded together. But this cannot long be the case. We have always promptly paid the interest on our debt, and no fears are entertained that we will not be able to do so hereafter, and the doctrine of repudiation has no advocate within the limits of our State. When we first commenced our system of internal improvement, and it became necessary to borrow money to carry it on, we at the same time, adopted the policy of raising, annually, by taxation, sufficient to pay punctually the interest of our debt. This is the true and settled policy of the State, and it has been owing to this that we have preserved our credit and met our engagements.

It has been mainly owing to the want of a similar policy, that the non-paying States have failed to pay their interest, which has so much shaken the public confidence indiscriminately in all State obligations. With our present and rapidly increasing resources, and the known determination of the citizens of the State to apply them to the faithful fulfillment of all our public engagements, we have every reason to believe that the credit of the State will soon recover from its present depression, and be duly appreciated both at home and abroad.

The creditors on the public works are entitled to your special consideration. The law of last session, although it was well intended at the time, and believed to be sufficient to enable the State to meet the demands of this class of our creditors, experience has shown was inadequate for the purpose intended. This meritorious class of creditors have spent their time, labor and money, in the service of the State, and many of them are greatly embarrassed for the want of funds long since due them. Justice requires, at the hands of the Legislature, that ample provisions be made to meet promptly their just claims. In doing this, the most certain and economical plan should be devised, and, if possible, at the same time, would not impair the credit of the State.

The Governor then closes with a rebuke of the Whig members for resigning at the extra session.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI.

Wednesday, December 21, 1842.

State Liberty Convention.

One week now to day. We hope our friends are all ready now, for a grand rally.

Don't Forget.

My brother, that your two dollars, and yours, my brother, are all that the Philanthropist now depends upon for life. We are full of faith, but our faith without your works, is dead.

Mr. Blanchard's Discourse.

On our first page is rich with thought, eloquently expressed. It is the best production of his that has ever appeared in our paper. It is long, but no one will tire reading it.

Doubtless, a few of his opinions, will find little sympathy with some of our subscribers—but the great body of the address will please every friend of reform. I intend to put it in the form of a tract for gratuitous circulation. We design to supply all the colleges, seminaries, &c., in the United States.

Price \$2.00 a hundred.

Old Scores.

The editor of the Logan Gazette makes the startling declaration, that he has an old score to settle with me. He then blusters away through several paragraphs, in which he charges me with "unscrupulous dishonesty," the "foullest injustice," the "blackest ingratitude," "overbearing blackguardism," "inordinate vanity," &c., &c. I have nothing further to say to this severe gentleman, than that he made a very great blunder, when he fancied he could get up a quarrel between the Philanthropist and Gazette.

Vindictive.

The Hon. J. S. Carpenter publishes in the Ohio Star, of November 17th, a philippic against me, nearly five columns long, steeped in the very gall of bitterness, and full of misrepresentation. The same article is republished in another Whig paper on the Reserve, and another still, has announced its purpose to give it place. Many other Whig papers, we doubt not, have been called on to circulate it. The object is manifest. The Philanthropist is in their way, and they would crush it, if they could.

I had prepared an answer to the article, but

disliking to fill my paper with personal matters, have laid it aside. If, however, any of my friends in Portage, Medina, or Logan counties, think it advisable to publish a reply, let them signify their wish, and it shall be furnished.

Ex-Secretary Badger.

Mr. Badger, late Secretary of the Navy, left in Washington, a family of slaves, consisting of a mother and six children, ranging from two, to fifteen years. He offered to Walter Freeman, the husband and father, the privilege of buying his wife and children, for \$1800. Freeman had about \$300 in hand, and as we learn from the Anti-Slavery Reporter, has nearly succeeded in raising the balance in New England.

Mr. Badger is said to be a native of New England. Whether he is a most honorable man, this Ex-Secretary of the Navy, to be speculating in the wife and children of another man. Would he trade in his own offspring? What business then has he to trade in children of another man's begetting? This trade in slaveholding is certainly as mean a thing as a man can be guilty of.

Gov. Seward and Colonel Webb.

Governor Seward, in pardoning Col. Webb, who was convicted of the crime of duelling, has sunk himself in the estimation of many, who till then had been his sincere admirers. We have heard no good reason assigned for this act of ill-judged mercy. The law against duelling in New York had remained a dead letter, but the increasing humanity of the age demanded its rescission and enforcement. And where could there be a better case for its enforcement? Col. Webb was a man of influence, extensively known, standing high with his party, of hardened spirit, had exhibited no sign of repentance, or change of sentiment. Where was the extenuating circumstance? His position in Society was a chief reason, why the law should be enforced against him—for when the proud and popular are made to feel the penalties of law, every man knows that he is secure, for even-handed justice presides; and the preventive influence of the punishment is tenfold greater than when inflicted on an obscure offender.

Vote of New York.

	Whig.	Dem.	Liberty.
Vote of 1840	222,011	216,808	2,062
" 1842	186,088	208,070	7,232
Loss	35,923	8,738	Gain, 4,600
Total loss	40,061		

The actual increase of votes in New York, the last two years, has been about 20,000. Here then, we have in New York, 60,000 voters staying away from the polls. This fact, together with similar facts in Ohio, and other States, shows what multitudes in the country are beginning to lose all confidence in the great political organizations.

Vermont.

Vermont seems in advance of all the other States, in her regard to the rights of humanity. For, as a certain school would term it, her reverence for man. Her Legislature at its last session, passed an act, abolishing capital punishment, substituting imprisonment for life in the Penitentiary, unless the Governor should after one year, issue a warrant, directing the criminal to be executed. This is an advance step in civilization, and Vermont deserves honor for thus taking the lead of all the States—but, we cannot understand the reasonableness of the condition, which invests one man, the Governor, with the awful power of life and death.

The following proceedings of the Legislature, show that this State is also taking the lead of all the other States on the subject of slavery. The fourth resolution is a new one, even for Vermont—and foreshadows the position yet to be taken by all the free States. All the resolutions were passed unanimously, by both Houses.

Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives.

1. That as the Representatives of the People of the State of Vermont, we do protest against the admission into the Union of any State whose constitution tolerates domestic slavery, or the annexation of Texas, or any other Territory, in which slavery exists.
2. That we believe that Congress has the power by the Constitution of the U. States, to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and in the territories of the U. States; and that if Congress refuse to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, that the seal of the General Government ought to be removed from that district, to a place where slavery and the slave trade do not exist.
3. That we believe Congress has constitutional power to prohibit the slave trade between the several States in this Union, and to make such laws as shall effectively prevent this trade, and ought to exercise this power.
4. That the Constitution of the U. States ought to be amended, so as to prevent the existence and maintenance of slavery in the United States in any form or manner.
5. That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to present the foregoing resolutions to their respective Houses in Congress, and to use their influence to carry out the principles thereof.

That the Governor of this State be requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Congress.

No quorum in the Senate, December 5th and 6th.

The second day of the session, Mr. Adams moved his resolution for the repeal of the 21st rule.

Mr. Wise raised a point of order, but the Speaker overruled it. After a few remarks from Mr. Adams and Mr. Wise.

Mr. Weller, who seems disposed to ape the last named gentlemen, moved to lay the whole subject on the table. The motion was decided in the negative, yeas 85, nays 93.

Mr. Everett moved the previous question—motion sustained, 84 yeas, 76 nays. But the House refused to take the main question, by a vote of 99 yeas, 84 nays. This rule threw the resolution beyond the power of the House for one day.

December 7th, it came up again, when the Speaker decided that debate was not in order, that the question now pending, was, "Shall the main question now be taken?"

W. Cost Johnson moved to lay the whole subject on the table. Motion lost, yeas 90, nays 91.

But the House then refused to take the main question, by a vote of 98 yeas, to 91 yeas. The subject coming up again the next day, Mr. Wise moved to lay it on the table, but the motion was lost—yeas 92, nays 95. Pretty close voting.

The question then recurring on ordering the main question, the vote stood, yeas 95, nays 100. Friday and Saturday, there was no session. At the next session, the motion of Johnson to lay on the table, the whole subject, prevailed.

A Brief Allusion.

The severity with which I have occasionally treated certain sects and parties, has awakened the ire of many, who place the good of such organizations above the interests of the cause of human rights. The Reverend Cornelius Springer, (I believe I give name, title and all), editor of the Western Recorder, is one of those. He seems to think himself set especially for the defence of the Methodist Protestant Church, and will

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

vil of dignities. But, I would just say, that had I published all the reverend gentlemen has been in the habit of saying against me, I should have done him such disservice, as no Christian man ought to do another.

From this, my gentle brother will understand the reason of the apparent neglect with which I have hitherto treated his many loving epistles to, and concerning, myself—and he must not be offended, if the same reason should hereafter prevent me from attending to his acutely satirical paragraphs, so assiduously as he might wish.

The Clermont Outrage.

Most of our city papers have noticed in becoming terms the outrage recently perpetrated in Clermont by Kidnappers from Kentucky, in forcibly carrying out of the State, the wife of Vincent Wigglesworth, a free colored man, and their four children. Effective measures, we believe, have been set on foot, for their recovery. A large meeting has been held in Clermont, without distinction of party, and has passed strong resolutions on the subject. It was far from being an abolition meeting, as will appear from some of the resolutions, which we quote.

"Whereas, We, the citizens of Clermont county have ever been ready to maintain and support every law provided for the redemption of fugitive slaves, escaping from the State of Kentucky in our own, when taken in a legal manner, as pointed out by an act of our own Legislature, made at the special solicitation of the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That the county and good feeling heretofore existing between the citizens of Ohio and Kentucky is not only desirable, but absolutely essential to the promotion of the best interests of both, and that to continue these friendly relations it is necessary, strictly, to refrain from interfering with the rights of property of either.

Resolved, That as citizens of Ohio, we feel it our duty to refrain from interfering with any of the laws or institutions of Kentucky, and more especially with that of slavery; nor do we feel the least compunction in aiding, abetting or assisting the escape of slaves from legal service; and when slaves so escaping are sought to be reclaimed in a lawful manner we have never interfered, nor will we, to thwart, or prevent the due execution of the laws of that State, or even our own.

Resolved, That kidnapping is a daring offense and heinous crime in the contemplation of our laws, and one that we cannot look upon with the least degree of allowance whatever, and that without the prompt execution of the laws in such cases made and provided, we have no security for the liberty of the free colored native residents of our State, or even our own.

Resolved, That the late abduction of the wife and children of Vincent Wigglesworth, whom we most solemnly believe to be free and entitled to the protection of our laws, is an outrage, and an insult to all law, and so very a mockery to all pretence of justice and humanity, as to call for immediate and satisfactory redress.

Resolved, That we cannot believe that the citizens of Kentucky will ever countenance kidnapping, any more than the people of Ohio do the stealing of slaves from their masters, but will readily lend every assistance to uphold the supremacy of our laws, and to bring to punishment the persons who have been guilty of their so flagrant violation.

Resolved, That the complaint sometimes made by the citizens of Kentucky, of our unwillingness to surrender fugitive slaves when demanded by their owners, is utterly unfounded and that we will not permit the least interference of the full enjoyment of their right to reclaim their property in a prompt and legal manner.

In regard to the whereas, we remark, that it was quite unnecessary for the good people of Clermont to proffer their readiness to maintain a law, which has been annulled by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The first resolution is disgraceful to the meeting, as it places the right of the farmer in Ohio to his farm and stock on the same level with the robber right of the slaveholder to his slave. The "right of property" in man! It is blasphemous.

The fifth resolution, is another of the same kind, placing kidnapping & aiding innocent men to escape from bondage, in the same category of crimes. Exquisite morality! Would these very discriminative people see no difference between the act of a set of freebooters who should kidnap American citizens, and sell them in Algiers, and the act of a christian captain, who should lend his vessel to aid their escape?

In reference to the third resolution, we would ask, why is kidnapping a "heinous crime?" Does the law make it so? Can the law make it a "heinous crime," to travel over a county bridge, at a faster gait than a walk? Why then is kidnapping a "heinous crime?" Because, it is reducing a man to the condition of a brute. Now, what is Slavery? Keeping a man in this condition. Slavery and kidnapping in principle, are identical. The kidnapper and slaveholder, then, are of the same family—both are heinous criminals. And what better is he, who is so full of reverence for the "heinous crime" of slaveholding, than the clutches of the slaveholder? No a jot better than either. His crime is that of kidnapping—he is but a legalized kidnapper. And yet these people boast in one resolution of their willingness to surrender up innocent fugitives from bondage—an act identical in principle with that, which in another resolution, they denounce as a "heinous crime."

The Colored People.

The Anti-Slavery people of Cincinnati are far from giving that countenance and substantial encouragement to their colored brethren, which a generous sympathy demands. Let us imagine ourselves in their condition—alien in the community where we live—borned down by a horrible weight of prejudice—unprotected by the laws—excluded from the privilege of educating our children—shut out from honorable employment, and doomed to see our offspring growing up under the curse of caste, listless, hopeless and idle, because unable to obtain situations with tradesmen or artisans. What would be our feelings? What should we think of the conduct of those, who professing to be our friends, behaved towards us like enemies? With what gratitude should we greet him who, too courageous to fear the scorn of the proud, or violence of the rabble, would dare treat us as MEN, seeking to do us favors, vindicating our rights, patronizing our industry, and encouraging in every way our efforts at self-improvement?

In view of the peculiarly depressed condition of our colored neighbors—the overwhelming competition they have to encounter, it is the great duty of Abolitionists to encourage their industry. Among the colored people in this place, are to be found excellent mechanics in various departments. The work they have turned out will bear the most rigid examination—and yet, for the most part, they remain unemployed—and this, too, while there is no lack of demand for labor and mechanical skill. That proslavery people should refuse to employ colored people is not to be wondered at, but that those who profess to sympathize with their wrongs, and desire their elevation, should shrink from giving a job to a colored artisan, is too bad—and yet we know of such persons. They fear to subject themselves to odium—being abolitionists, they must be cautious how they show any sympathy with colored people, or any wish to minister to their welfare. Quoted Abolitionists these! Are they not ashamed of themselves? Afraid to bestow their patronage where their industry, and labor, prove to be a curse or a favor? If such a one has a house to be mended, or an out-house to be patched, he may, on a pinch, give the job to a colored man—but if a house is to be built, he must take care—the colored man will be too visible.

The late rigid enforcement of the Black laws in the South, has driven multitudes of colored people, engaged in the southern trade, out of employment. This is an additional reason, why anti-slavery men should look well to the condition of these poor people.

One thing, however, appears to be evident—there are more colored people in Cincinnati than can now find profitable employment, or a comfortable home. The country holds out to all such advantages not to be lightly overlooked. We like to see colored men becoming farmers. Many obstacles are constantly thrown in their way, if they would seek to become mechanics. There are the difficulties in the way of learning a trade, and the little employment to be gained when it is learned. But, with moderate enterprise, colored people can become farmers, good, substantial farmers, and then they are elevated at once above dependence upon niggardly patronage. Amidst their well stocked farms they are respectable, and feel that they are so. They are conscious of the dignity of producers, and are not crushed to the earth by that spirit of caste, which like an ever present fiend broods over them in cities. Their children, too, grow up cheerful and active, with spirits unbroken by persecution and contempt. True, the testimony and school laws still subject them to many disadvantages, much vexation. But these they must endure like men. A better day is coming. Evils like these will not last forever. And meantime, by practicing self denial, and the virtues of endurance and patience, their spirits will be developed, matured, and disciplined. But, in cities, doomed to idleness or menial employment, surrounded by vicious influences, exposed to ruinous temptations, with the constant pressure upon them of the pity or contempt of a corrupt community; the chances of their elevation are greatly diminished.

Captious.

A friend of ours, who cares very little for sublime abstractions about slavery, but is fond of doing something against it, lately wrote an article for the Xenia Free Press, defining the position of the Liberty Party. Mr. Garrison, who has never raised an argument against the Party, founded upon any statement or reasoning in the Philanthropist, uses the definition of the Liberty Party, as a basis for a hostile paper, against the entire Liberty organization, East, West, North and South. This is neither ingenuously ingenious. Nor do his comments on some statements of our friend, show much logic or candor, as might be looked for in the editor of the Liberator.

Our friend having remarked that—
"The Liberty Party embraces the doctrine of the Liberty men of 1776. They constituted the first American Political Party. The Liberty Party of our day, is but this party revived. It is the old original party of the Declaration and the Constitution." Mr. Garrison comments on this wise.

"Now it is evident, that if this party is identical with that of 1776, & is prepared to go no further, than did that party, then instead of doing anything for the abolition of slavery, it will consult its own selfish desires—hold the hope of promise to the ear, and break it to the wind; and prove treacherous to all its professed principles."

Very true! This same party "prepared to go no further than did that party," had not Mr. G. been swayed by prejudice, he would have seen, that the writer meant simply to say, that in doctrine, spirit, and intention the Liberty men of 1776, were identical. The doctrine of the Liberty men of 1776, was that all men are created equal, with certain inalienable rights. Their spirit was intense hatred of oppression. Their intention was, (with a few exceptions confined chiefly to South Carolina and Georgia) to apply the doctrine to the extinction of slavery. But their policy was LIMITED, and time-serving, and therefore was wrong. Let us remember, however, the darkness which then prevailed in relation to human rights—and that, while contented to certain concessions to slaveholders, they inwardly rejoiced in obtaining such advantages, as would, in their estimation, insure the overthrow of slavery.

We live in the light of a better day; and our experience has shown us, that the concessions of our fathers have thwarted their intention. The Liberty men of this day, therefore, while embracing the doctrine, enshrining the spirit, and cherishing the intentions, of the Liberty men of 1776, see their errors, and would adopt a better policy to secure what they so earnestly desired—the policy of never making concession to any wrong—of uncompromising adherence, to right principle, in all their measures.

The charity that thinketh no evil is false to put that construction on a writer's words, which is in accordance with the manifest intention of his language. J. A. Collins is a right hand man of Mr. Garrison, and was on the Business Committee which reported the following resolutions, in the Convention of the Ohio American Society, at Cadiz. The resolutions were adopted.

Resolved, That if the wishes and policy of the fathers of this republic had been carried out by their successors, slavery would now be extinct.

Resolved, That the constitution of the United States confers upon Congress no more power to legislate for the promotion, than for the abolition of slavery in the several States.

Resolved, That so far as we exert any political influence, it shall be directed to the support of the principles and policy of the founders of the government upon the subject of slavery.

This last resolution, clearly contains a wrong sentiment. God forbid that any of us should exert our political influence in support of the policy of the founders of the government! But, how unfair were we, on the strength of this title word, overlooked, disallowed, by the Convention, to raise an argument against the Ohio American Anti-Slavery Society—to charge it with selfishness and corruption—and close by the exclamation, "What hope is offered for the speedy overthrow of slavery, by such a party, even shall it speedily become dominant over all other parties?" I know that that society meant no such thing, as to sanction the misnomer policy of the founders of the Government—and Mr. Garrison knows, that that policy is abhorred by the Liberty party.

Why not treat each other fairly?

Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio.

Relative to population, the Liberty vote is larger in Ohio than New York; and, in proportion to the number of Abolitionists, greater in Ohio, than Massachusetts. This is the more creditable to Ohio, when it is remembered, that the anti-slavery agitation commenced in both these States before it was felt in this, and that in both a great deal more effort has been laid out. Besides, the vote in this State has doubled in one year, so that in this respect also, Ohio had the advantage of her older sisters.

That her Liberty vote will be largely augmented, by another year; we infer, from the fact, that many Abolitionists voted with the old parties, at the late election, as a last experiment from the consideration, that the Whig party is so completely prostrated, and the Democratic so clearly triumphant, that many Whig and Democratic anti-slavery men will be detached from their respective parties, the former from despair of accomplishing anything by continued adhesion, the latter by the reflection that their aid will no longer be required—both being thus prepared to fall in with the current of the Liberty movement; from the fact, that the old political organization are losing the confidence of multitudes of reflecting and serious men; and finally, we infer it, because the principles of the Liberty party are great truths which are daily forcing themselves into the public mind, which is becoming more and more impressed with their importance.

One thing more—should the Democratic Legislature, in addition to repealing the Black law, pass an act, prohibiting State magistrates from acting under the law of Congress, of 1793, in relation to fugitives from labor; they would take away from that large class of Whig Abolitionists, who are forever urging that their party on the whole is more favorable to the cause of human rights, the grave plea for not going in the Liberty movement, so that we may not expect from this cause a large accession of Liberty voters.

The late rigid enforcement of the Black laws in the South, has driven multitudes of colored people, engaged in the southern trade, out of employment. This is an additional reason, why anti-slavery men should look well to the condition of these poor people.

Ohio Legislature.

The first week of the session was occupied chiefly with the election of officers, appointment of committees, and preparation for business.

Resolutions were passed protesting against the action of Congress, on the appropriation bill, in putting an end to the general ticket system.

Bills were introduced for the districting the State, for the reapportionment of personal property, under execution, for enabling certain banks whose charters are about to expire, to close their business, and providing for the prosecution of suits against the same; for taxing capital invested in Bank stock &c. Then there were bills to repeal chapters and grant charters—reports, petitions, resolutions. Then there was an excited debate about the propriety of substituting open voting for balloting, in elections of officers of the House. Messrs. McNulty & Byington went against the ballot—they would have the acts of the servants of the people, open to the inspection of their masters. The House decided to elect the officers viva voce, & proceeded to do so. Mr. Atkinson, Whig, when his name was called, said it was of no use to vote on the question of excusing him, for whatever might be the decision of the House, he would not vote and the House might do as it pleased—it could not compel him to vote. An angry debate sprang up. Mr. McNulty wished to have him punished for contempt of the House. Mr. Atkinson said he had conscientious scruples about voting. Mr. McNulty insisted on his being punished—but the House seemed disinclined. At length McNulty's name was called, and by way of showing the effect of an evil precedent, he refused to vote, and defied the power of the House to make him. At last the house adjourned, but on the following Monday, McNulty and Byington were out voted, and the old mode of ballot resorted to, in the election.

McNulty and Atkinson are too punky for grave legislators—and as for Mr. Olds, who thought Mr. Atkinson ought to be excused from voting on the principle that it is "hard to make a whistle out of a pig's tail"—he is altogether too witty for his place.

On the second day of the session, Mr. Steedman, one of the two members representing the new North-Western counties, introduced a bill for the repeal of the Black Act. The same day, Dr. Earle of Portage, moved a resolution for appointing a committee to inquire into the expediency of repealing all laws making distinctions on account of color.

The resolution after a short debate was postponed indefinitely, by a vote of 47 to 22.

The fourth day of the session, Mr. Steedman's bill passed its third reading, when it was discussed by Messrs. Earle, Steedman, Byington, and Atkinson. Mr. Earle made an effort, by moving an amendment, to have the law relating to the testimony of blacks and mulattoes repealed, but it failed. Mr. Byington opposed the bill, for he wished to keep his skirts clear of abolitionism, in every shape.

Mr. Steedman "wished to define his position. The law proposed to be repealed, was passed at the instance of Kentucky. But since the people of that state had sent agents here to interfere in our domestic concerns, he thought it nothing but justice to let them take care of their own negroes, without calling for the aid of a party, which has been treated in bad faith."

A pretty confession truly, that for the last three years, Ohio has been the negro-keeper, the overseer of the Kentucky slaveholder! And then, think of the honorable motive named by Mr. Steedman, in his effort to change her relations in this respect—not because the office of slave-catcher and negro-keeper was disgraceful to Ohio—but because the Black Act was a violation of humanity—but we are determined to be revenged of Kentucky, for sending her orators here, to aid the Whigs! Mean, mean, to the last degree! That law was either right or wrong—if right, no petty resentment against Kentucky could warrant its repeal. If wrong, no county could sanction it, and its repeal would be insisted on, just because it is wrong. Legislatures degrade themselves, and violate every rule of right, when they suffer their acts to be dictated by caprice, passion or spite. But, we are unwilling to believe our Legislature so bad as Mr. Steedman's remarks might lead us to think. Let us hope, that the majority who passed the bill for the repeal of the law, were glad of an opportunity to undo a disgraceful and criminal act—and that the reason assigned by Mr. Steedman was but a pretext, under which they were willing to shelter themselves from the odium of being denounced as abolitionists by the pro-slavery rabble of the community.

Mr. Byington made an effort to have the bill postponed indefinitely, but there was 50 yeas to 21 yeas on the proposition. The bill was then passed by a vote of 46 to 24. The party complexion is as follows:

DEMOCRATS.

YEAS.—J. D. White, M. Reese, J. Reid, G. W. Sharp, I. E. James, W. McClung, W. Douglas, W. Wakefield, Israel Brown, John Gruber, I. Greene, P. Humphrey, J. B. Steedman G. C. Mudgett, R. Warren, J. C. Clark, E. B. Olds, J. P. Henderson, J. Larivill, J. Wilford.—20.

NAYS.—J. B. McFarland, J. B. King, J. Martin, J. Meredith, Daniel Kelly, A. Gordon, Le Grand Byington, Elihu Johnson, Wm. Nelson, Caleb J. McNulty, C. Okey, R. W. Cahill, H. C. Brish, Rudolphus, James Kilgore, D. McConnell.—17.

ABSENT.—N. Spindler.—1.

WHIGS.

YEAS.—J. A. Smith, R. Robinson, J. B. Ackley, W. B. McCrea, D. Fisher, J. Chenoweth, R. Campbell, J. P. Converse, J. Fudge, S. Atherton, N. Dyke, J. M. Gallagher, J. Counts, J. McClure, R. C. Schenck, C. Bowen, T. Earle, S. H. Pardee, N. Larsh, A. Sewrad, J. H. Baldwin, N. Webb, J. Atkinson.—24.

NAYS.—Thomas Ross, O. Curry, I. Houseman, D. Chambers, G. W. Woodbridge, J. Probasco.—6.

ABSENT.—J. Futtie, S. Fuller.—2.

From this vote, as from several others, it would seem, that those two aspirants after supreme control, Byington and McNulty, are by no means invincible.

About the time of the introduction of Steedman's bill, McNulty brought forward a bill for the repeal of the charter of Oberlin Institute. On the third reading of the bill, the Depravity of the House took occasion to belch forth its venom against this institution. Its two great sins are,

first, that its members and professors will not betray the wanderer; secondly, that it would extend the benefits of education to all, without distinction of class or color. For these two crimes, the McNulty and Byington school of Legislators, would crush it. They think it a disgrace to the Legislature of Ohio to grant its sanction in the form of a charter to such an institution!

Mr. Byington had lived within the sphere of its baleful influence for eight years. He was familiar with its venoms and incendiary character, poisoning the minds of youth, and distracting the peace, dignity and morals of the State, under a plea of humanity and society, but in defiance of every obligation of both. He denounced with great severity, the individuals who control the Institute and their practices. There is more evil inflicted by that institution, (said Mr. B.) upon this State and country, than by any other institution west of the mountains. It is a band of law breakers and negro stealers supported by enemies of this country abroad, and enemies at home. General Ransom, with her thousand tongues, had published the enormities of that institution all over the State and Union. Its managers confessed the charges—were proud of them! He would therefore vote for the bill!

Reasonable men! condemn an institution, reveal its charter, without a moment's investigation of the charges brought against it! Nothing can exceed the wickedness and absurdity of your true negro-haters.

On motion of Mr. Schenck, the bill was laid on the table, by a vote of 36 to 35. So much for the first week of the session.

Monday, 12th, in the Senate, Mr. Bartley, from the Judiciary Committee, to which were referred the proceedings of a meeting, in Batavia, Clermont co., concerning the abduction of the wife of Vincent Wigglesworth, and his children, reported that no legislative interference was required, the existing laws on kidnapping, making provisions for the punishment of the offence complained of.

If Mr. Bartley's wife and children had been stolen, by slaveholders, we presume he would have come to the conclusion that the legislature had a right to interfere, and could interfere successfully. A just retribution for this heartless wretch, would be, to be deprived of his wife and children.

In the case of Eliza Jane Johnson, who was kidnapped, the legislature interfered promptly, and the civil authorities of Kentucky surrendered her immediately. The laws against kidnapping make provision for the punishment of kidnappers, but what will they do for the reclamation of the kidnapped? It is the duty of the legislature to pass resolutions strongly reprobating this act of kidnapping, and calling upon the Governor of the State to demand the immediate surrender of the poor victims. Has the legislature nothing to do, with the protection of the people of Ohio? Is it nothing to this body, that the majesty of the State is insulted, its laws set at defiance and the rights of every citizen put in jeopardy?

We hope the action of the House may be more conformable to Justice and Reason. The final refusal of the legislature to act in such a case, would cover it with infamy; it would be equivalent to an invitation to the kidnapper to redouble his activity; equivalent to a declaration of a want of power or inclination to protect their constituents.

December 14th, Samuel Medary was elected State Printer, and Mr. Allen re-elected Senator for six years.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE.

WASHINGTON CITY, 12th mo., 10th, 1842.

FRIEND BAILEY: Congress has been in session four days of the present week, but the Senate had not a quorum the first two days.

In the Senate on the 7th, S. S. Crafts, of Vermont, and W. L. Dayton, of New Jersey, were elected to the Senate. The former in place of Senator Phelps resigned, and the latter in place of S. L. Southard, deceased.

T. H. Benton, gave notice of an intention to introduce a bill to repeal the Bankrupt law.

On the 8th, the Senate went into the election of Chaplain which resulted as follows: For Tustun, 26 votes for Bullfinch, 2. Scattering, 1. So Tustun will be Chaplain for the Senate during the session, and according to a resolution passed in the House, will change every week with one yet to be elected by the House.

T. H. Benton introduced his bill for the repeal of the Bankrupt law, which was read the first time, it proposes to operate in new cases only.

No other business of importance has been transacted in this branch of Congress. Senator Freestone and Calhoun have both resigned their seats, the latter will stay however to the end of the session; though he has not yet reached here on account of ill health in his family. In the place of the former, the Legislature of South Carolina have elected the celebrated George McDuffie, not only to fill the vacancy left by the term for which his predecessor was elected should expire, (the 4th of March next), but for six years ensuing that period. So we have in the highest seat of the council of this nation, the man so renowned for his position of the American principle.

Such was the depth of his penetrating mind as to make the prediction as early as 1834, that 25 years would scarcely elapse, till it would be found expedient in order to perfect the social system, to make slaves of the Northern laborer. He considered that "American Slavery would not be more manifestly consistent with the will of God, if written with a sunbeam in the heavens, and crying aloud the interest of the South, for the purpose of sustaining their peculiar institution, and crippling the interest of the Northern laborer, it is time the free States should have representatives in that body, who will give their influence on the side of liberty.

In the House on the 5th, (the first day of the Session) after the usual resolutions were passed, providing the members with newspapers, &c. Geo. N. Briggs, of Massachusetts, offered a resolution to amend the 19th rule, so as to exclude from the confederaries of the capital all intoxicating drink.

H. Everett, of Vermont, gave notice of his intention to repeal the Bankrupt law.

J. Q. Adams gave notice that he should offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the 21st rule of conducting business in this House, in the following words: "No petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territory, or the slave trade between the States or Territories of the United States, in which it now exists,

shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever," be, and the same is hereby rescinded.

Henry A. Wise objected to the reception of the resolution.

The Speaker said it was only offered as a notice.

W. C. Johnson, of Maryland, inquired whether it was susceptible of amendment.

The Speaker said not until it came properly before the House.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

12th Month, 6th.

W. C. Johnson, of Maryland, gave notice that he should leave to introduce a bill to relieve the several States and Territories of this Union, and the District of Columbia.

W. Halsted gave notice that he should introduce a bill in reference to taking testimony in cases of contested elections.

J. Q. Adams called for the reading of the resolution, which he gave notice of his intention to introduce. The resolution having been read, H. A. Wise insisted that it was not in order to consider the resolution as there was much business remaining on the calendar, from last session, which had the precedence.

J. Q. Adams, said the reason why he thus had early submitted the resolution was, that there was a general rule of the House, by which for the first thirty days of the session, the reception of petitions was the first business to be transacted by the House. That this rule had been in existence from the commencement of the government, and that there was a rule made by which a large class of petitions was excluded from reception, they came from one section of the country and not from another, and he had always considered the 21st rule by which these petitions were excluded as unjust and a violation of the Constitution, which secured to all classes the right of petition. He did not wish to take up the time of the House to discuss the question, but was ready at that moment to take the resolution on his part, in behalf of his constituents that he felt authorized to submit the resolution—it was to secure to them their rights which are by that rule withheld from them.

H. A. Wise raised a point of order. He thought if the House should consent to receive the resolution it would require a vote of two thirds to adopt it. The Speaker overruled the point of order. He was of the opinion that the resolution was in order.

Wise thought the States should be called for petitions, although the committees to which they could be referred, had not yet been appointed.

J. B. Weller of Ohio, moved to lay the resolution on the table.

And the yeas and nays having been ordered, H. A. Wise inquired whether his question of order had not the precedence of this motion. The Speaker replied,

The Chair overrules the question of order. Wise said he would not take up the time of the House by appealing, but he could not acquiesce in the decision of the Chair.

The yeas and nays were then called, and the motion to lay on the table was negatived—yeas, 85, nays, 83.

H. Everett of Vermont said, as this was a matter of great importance, he would ask for the previous question, which was ordered; yeas, 84, nays, 74.

And the question being stated, shall the main question be now put?

Wise inquired whether it would be in order to introduce the resolution of the further consideration of the subject until some future day.

The Speaker said it would not, except by general consent.

H. A. Wise then asked the common consent of the House. Objection being made, the yeas and nays were taken which resulted yeas, 84, nays, 99.

So the main question was not ordered, and the resolution was laid over.

The death of Jas. W. Williams, of Md. having been announced by his colleague as Mason, the House adjourned.

12th Month, 7th.

Notices by members of their intention to introduce sundry bills were given. One for issuing convertible Exchequer Bills—one for enlisting boys in the naval service—one for extending the Cumberland road westward through Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and for building a bridge at Wheeling—one for erecting seven Marine Hospitals on the western waters—one for modifying the revenue act so as to remove the duty upon salt one for declaring what is the Northern boundary line of the State of Missouri—one to authorize drawbacks on goods conveyed by land to Santa Fee—one for the improvement of the Hudson river—one for establishing a Warehouse system. W. C. Johnson moved for the printing of five thousand copies of a document in relation to State debts. Negatived, yeas, 57, nays, 59.

J. Q. Adams observed that the resolution he had submitted the day previous in reference to the 21st rule had not been disposed of. He therefore, called for its consideration. Some conversation took place between J. Q. Adams, H. Everett, Speaker, and others, when W. C. Johnson moved to lay the whole subject on the table.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, B. A. Bidlack of Pennsylvania, asked to be excused from voting. His vote, heretofore in relation to this subject, had been the only one, he believed, called in question publicly by the newspapers of his own party in his district; and he had, in consequence, been held to account. The chief reason he did not wish to vote was, that he did not desire to appear inconsistent. If he should not be excused, he would stand by his friends and vote against the resolution, the rule, salt or sugar, although he thought it rather hard that Northern men should be required to do so, when some Southern men will not themselves pursue the same course.

The Speaker stated that the gentleman from Pa. wished to be excused when Bidlack withdrew his motion. The question to lay on the table was then taken, and lost, yeas, 90, nays, 91.

The question then returned, shall the main question be now put? and it was negatived, yeas, 91, nays, 93.

So the subject was laid over till the following day.

The President's message was received and read. Ten thousand copies were ordered to be printed, and the House adjourned.

12th mo, 8th.

The resolution of J. Q. Adams was taken up as unfinished business.

The question pending was, shall the main question be now put?

W. A. Jones of Va. moved to lay the whole subject on the table.

The yeas and nays being ordered, stood, yeas 92, nays 95.

So the resolution was not laid upon the table.

W. C. Johnson introduced a resolution to rescind the one hour rule. W. C. J. said it was far from his purpose to desire to delay the transaction of business; but that a reasonable time should be allowed for discussion, was of great importance; it was due to the country and to the members of the House; that time should be allowed for explaining their positions, and submitting their opinions. He had wished to speak on some particular subject himself and could not have time allowed him, [a voice] on the assumption of State debts." But without consuming more time, he would move the previous question; it was seconded.

When McKennan, of Pennsylvania, said he believed it to be one of the best rules of the House, and moved to lay the resolution on the table. And on the question, being taken it was decided in the affirmative, yeas 115, nays 70.

J. B. Weller moved that when the House adjourn it adjourn to meet on Monday next; the motion prevailed, yeas 91, nays 60.

On motion of M. Fillmore the House adjourned.

12th month, 12th.

Some debate took place to-day in the House on the reference of the subjects, recommended in the President's Message, to appropriate committees. C. Cushing, a friend of the measures of the President, wished that portion of it relative to the Exchequer, referred to the committee of the whole House. A motion which he made to that effect was lost. C. J. Ingersoll, a leading man among the Democratic party, took occasion to say that he was immovably opposed to this measure or any other Treasury project originating with the Executive.

A motion to refer to the committee of the whole, that part of the Message respecting the refunding to Gen. Jackson, the fine imposed on him at New Orleans, was negatived, yeas 97, nays 103. It was referred to the committee on the Judiciary.

12 month, 13th.

H. A. Wise and J. M. Botts, of Va. debated about an hour to-day about a point of order, and were a great portion of that time speaking contrary to the rules of the House and the decision of the Chair. The subject was a resolution offered by Mr. Botts to appoint a committee to make inquiry into the truth of certain charges against the Whig party, as

Subscription list within one year. Subscribers not paying in advance must be taken with great caution.

More agents wanted.